



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their ideas from India—a notion which still unworthily survives. The concluding portion of the lecture touches on the survivals of the doctrine of rebirths in the religion of Mani, among the Moslems, the Druses, and various other sects down to our own time.

But it is unnecessary to speak further in detail. Those who would be instructed must read this learned and illuminating little book.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. ISMAR J. PERITZ. The Abingdon Press. 1915. Pp. 336. \$1.50.

The appearance of this volume is a welcome sign of the times. It forms part of a series designed to supply "a more complete and comprehensive study of the Bible" than that usually offered to Sunday-school teachers and other lay students. When one compares it with the intellectual pabulum served to such students not so many years ago, one is equally surprised and delighted at the change. Dr. Peritz is a master of his subject, and he places the full resources of his knowledge at the service of those he seeks to help. The student is thus put *en rapport* with the best-accredited results of scientific research.

An astonishing amount of information is compressed within the 336 pages of the book. The history of Israel is traced from its primeval dawn to the period of Roman rule under Herod the Great. Movements of tribes and nations, factions and sects, are followed with fine discernment and skill. Apart from the facts of history, too, pictures are drawn of Palestinian scenery and social customs, personalities are set in relief, the principles of literary criticism are unfolded, emphasis is laid upon the religious complexion of the history, and the literature is studied on the background of the times. The style is easy, and the type pleasant and carefully read, though we observe mis-spellings of the names Xerxes (p. 251) and Apollonius (p. 300).

The critical standpoint throughout is moderate. While Dr. Peritz acknowledges that the patriarchal stories are legendary, he finds beneath them a witness to real historical personalities and movements. Moses is accorded the supreme place in the religious history of his people, little difficulty being experienced in ascribing to him the substance of the Decalogue in Ex. 20. In his treatment of the later prophets, the author is free from the eschatological schematism of Gressmann and his school, the eschatological patches

being naturally referred to Apocalyptic Judaism and the prophets portrayed as the moral and religious teachers of their own age. He defends, however, the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah, the early relation of Jeremiah to the Deuteronomic Reformation, and the authenticity of his prophecy of the New Covenant. As more novel in point of view we note the suggestion that the tragedy supposed to be adumbrated in Hos. 1 is but a midrash of the editor's, "expanding the elements contained in the other two sections," and the well-marshalled arguments for the dating of Ezra's first visit to Jerusalem in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes II, that is, 397 B.C. (pp. 260 f.).

ALEXANDER R. GORDON.

PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

JUDAISM AND ST. PAUL. C. G. MONTEFIORE. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1915.
Pp. iv, 240. \$1.25.

Mr. Montefiore has attempted in this book to face a problem which has received far too little attention both from Christian and Jewish scholars. It may be stated shortly as follows: If one reads the Epistles of Paul with the intention of comparing them with Jewish writings of the Rabbinical type represented by the Talmud, one is struck by the fact that Paul does not so much controvert Jewish teaching as ignore it, and that what he controverts is seriously different from Rabbinical Judaism. Of course many writers on Paul have surmounted this obvious difficulty by the simple process of first assuming that Paul must have been controverting the general Jewish doctrine which he had learned at Jerusalem, and then reconstructing this Judaism by claiming for it everything which Paul denies. That is the origin of a great many Christian presentations of Rabbinical Judaism. Unfortunately, when one turns to any of the Jewish writings of that time, or of the periods succeeding, he finds no trace of this reconstructed Judaism. That is a very curious result, and it was taken advantage of by van Manen to support his theory that the Pauline Epistles were not written by Paul. His position was that we know that Paul had originally been a Jew and was educated in the Rabbinical doctrines of Jerusalem; if therefore he wrote theological treatises or letters attacking Judaism, he might be supposed to show accurate knowledge of that which he attacks.¹

¹ Dr. Foakes-Jackson writes to me: "I remember addressing a Jewish audience in the vestry of one of the London synagogues on Josephus. In the discussion several scholars of distinction, among them Drs. Büchler and Friedländer, maintained that Josephus showed evident ignorance of the Rabbinic teaching of his age and could not have been, as he so loudly professes, an expert in the law and religion of his countrymen."